

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 16 and 17 are amended, leaving claims 1-20 pending with claims 1 and 16 being independent. The amendments are supported at least by FIGS. 5-9; page 13, line 22 - page 14, line 6; and page 18, line 27 - page 19, line 24 of the original specification of the present application. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ide (U.S. 6,361,290).

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites a hermetic compressor comprising a gas flow forming part forming a gas flow that enables gas to flow in a constant direction in a sound deadening space by one end opening of an outlet pipe disposed adjacent to a first surface of the sound deadening space being open so that the gas flowing into a compression chamber from the one end opening of the outlet pipe flows and circulates in a constant direction along the first surface and by opening one end opening of an inlet pipe at a place in which the gas flows into the sound deadening space.

Such a structure enables suppression of the inflow of oil to the compressing chamber without any special material.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a compressor. In particular, Ide discloses a suction muffler that comprises two components made of resin and that is manufactured using ultrasonic welding. However, Ide clearly fails to show a gas flow forming part that has a structure that enables gas to flow in a constant direction in a sound deadening space. That is, Ide fails to disclose that one end opening of an outlet pipe disposed adjacent to a first surface of the sound deadening space is open so that the gas flowing into a compression chamber from the one end opening of the outlet pipe flows and circulates in a constant direction along the first surface.

Moreover, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Ide such that it would have rendered claim 1 obvious. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. 2004/0179955).

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 16 recites a hermetic compressor wherein a gas flowing into a compression chamber from an internal opening of an outlet pipe flows and circulates in a constant direction along one wall of a top wall, bottom wall and side walls of a sound deadening space by opening the internal opening of the outlet pipe adjacent to the one wall, and an internal opening of an inlet pipe opens at a place in which the gas flows into the sound deadening space so as to constitute a gas flow forming part that causes a flow of the refrigerant gas along a bottom part of the sound deadening space in a constant direction toward an oil discharge opening to cause the oil in the sound deadening space to pool at the oil discharge opening.

Such a structure enables suppression of the inflow of oil to the compressing chamber without any special material.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a compressor. In particular, while Lee discloses a suction muffler having a structure for converting a flowing motion of the refrigerant into a spiral flowing motion, the Lee structure is distinct from the structure recited in claim 16 of the present application. That is, Lee fails to disclose that a refrigerant gas flow flows in a constant direction along one wall of a top wall, a bottom wall and the side walls of a sound deadening space by opening the internal opening of the outlet pipe adjacent to the one wall, and an internal opening of an inlet pipe opens at a place in which the gas flows into the sound deadening space, as recited in claim 16 of the present application.

Moreover, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Lee such that it would have rendered claim 16 obvious. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 16 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ko INAGAKI et al.

/Jeffrey J. Howell/

By 2010.01.21 13:02:39 -05'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell

Registration No. 46,402

Attorney for Applicants

JJH/ekb

Washington, D.C. 20005-1503

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

January 21, 2010